

REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 43-72 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1-42 have been cancelled. New claims 43-72 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the claims as originally filed and in the specification. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any cancelled claim in a continuation application. No new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

The drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5). The Examiner states:

Drawing figure 5 does not include a reference to element 240 that is described in the Specification on page 11, line 13 as “the user via suggestion component.”

(June 26, 2006 Office action, pg. 2).

Applicant has amended the paragraph starting on page 11, line 8, of the specification to state “If it finds helpful information within storage 230, it uses such information to suggest possible definition to the user via suggestions component 240.” Since Figure 5 shows a “Suggestions Component 240”, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings satisfy the requirements under 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5).

Claim Rejections

Previously pending claims 1-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0093342 to Arbo et al. (hereinafter “Arbo”).

Newly added claim 43 recites:

43. A method for defining data mappings between data elements in a first data structure and data elements in a second data structure, the method comprising:

selecting a first data element in the first data structure for mapping;

suggesting a first possible data mapping definition to a user based on a first previous data mapping definition, the first possible data mapping definition defining a mapping from the first data element in the first data structure to a first data element in the second data structure; and

mapping the first data element in the first data structure to the first data element in the second data structure according to the first possible data mapping definition in response to acceptance of the first possible data mapping definition by the user,

wherein the first previous data mapping definition defines a mapping from a data element in a third data structure to a data element in a fourth data structure, at least one of the third and fourth data structures being different from the first and second data structures.

Arbo is directed to “the mapping of personal information management data which is synchronized in a client/server environment” (pg. 1, para. 0002). Arbo states:

FIGS. 9A, 9B, and 9C depict a mapping method 900 of the preferred embodiment which is utilized and implemented by the universal mapper 126 to map PIM data in the direction (i.e., to/from vCard) associated with the universal mapper method, MapToUC or MapToVCard, called by the SyncML server 124 as described above. Broadly, the mapping method 900 comprises steps of calling each configuration vCard property mapper 206 and allowing each vCard property mapper 206 to process the vCard property for which it is responsible. . . . [T]he called vCard property mapper 206 searches the history/association table for a match on the property name, parameters, and actual data in an attempt to identify the mapping(s) that were made, if any, during the previous synchronization session(s) for the field(s) and/or vCard property for which the called vCard property mapper 206 has mapping responsibility. If a previous mapping(s) is identified, the vCard property mapper 206 retrieves history data from the history/association table, and maps and/or formats the vCard property parameter(s) and field(s) for which it is responsible according to the previous mapping history data, thereby maintaining previously made associations of PIM data between the server iPIM storage object 114 and a vCard from a client device 104.

(Pg. 11, paras. 0071-0072).

As seen from above, if a previous mapping is identified, Arbo automatically maps the vCard property parameters and fields according to the previous mapping. In contrast, claim 43 recites “suggesting a first possible data mapping definition to a user based on a first previous data mapping definition, the first possible data mapping definition defining a mapping from the first data element in the first data structure to a first data element in the second data structure” and “mapping the first data element in the first data structure to the first data element in the second data structure according to the first possible data mapping definition in response to acceptance of the first possible data mapping definition by the user.” In other words, a possible data mapping definition is suggested to the user based on a previous data mapping definition, but mapping will not be made according to the suggested possible data mapping definition unless a user accepts the suggestion.

Further, Arbo states:

Each UC record, generally, corresponds to a single vCard. The UC records have a plurality of fields or structures (i.e., sometimes referred to herein as “UC fields”) which, preferably, store: . . . historical association information describing the previous mapping of vCard properties and parameters to/from appropriate UC fields to provide a user of a client device 104 with predicted results and to avoid the loss of PIM data during multiple-point synchronization . . .

(Pg. 5, para. 0043). Thus, in Arbo, historical association information of a vCard is only used for that vCard.

In claim 43, however, “the first previous data mapping definition defines a mapping from a data element in a third data structure to a data element in a fourth data structure, at least one of the third and fourth data structures being different from the first and second data structures.”

Hence, a previous data mapping definition for one pair of data structures can be used to suggest a possible data mapping definition for a different pair of data structures.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Arbo. Since claims 53 and 63 each recite elements similar to those of claim 43, it is respectfully submitted that those claims, and the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Arbo for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: November 27, 2006



Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449